	1
1	COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	
8	Tuesday, March 30th, 2021
9	
10	
11	
12	LOCATION:
13	VIA ZOOM
14	
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Maria McCool, RPR
25	Official Court Reporter

_		
		2
1	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	
2		
3	WILLIAM GAUGHAN, PRESIDENT	
4	KYLE DONAHUE, VICE PRESIDENT	
5	MARK MCANDREW	
6	JESSICA ROTHCHILD	
7	THOMAS SCHUSTER	
8		
9	LORI REED, CITY CLERK	
10	KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK	
11	KEVIN HAYES, COUNCIL SOLICITOR	
12		
13		
14		ļ
15		ļ
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	1	

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. GAUGHAN: Would everyone please remain standing for a moment of silent reflection for our service men and women throughout the world and also for those who have passed away in our community.

Let us also take a moment of silence for all of the people in our community, in our country and throughout our world who have passed away from the COVID-19 pandemic. This pandemic has turned our world upside down. But we must remain hopeful and strong.

We continue to pray for the doctors, nurses, researchers and all medical professionals who seek to heal and help those affected and who put themselves at risk in the process, may they have protection and peace.

Whether we are home or abroad, surrounded by many people suffering from this illness or only a few, let us stick together, endure together, mourn together and in place of our anxiety let us have hope and peace. Thank you. Roll call, please.

MS CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.

_

1 MR. SCHUSTER: Present. MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew. 2 3 MR. MCANDREW: Present. 4 MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild. 5 DR. ROTHCHILD: Here. MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue. 6 MR. DONAHUE: 7 Here. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Here. An executive 10 session was held prior to our meeting tonight 11 to discuss potential litigation and personnel 12 issues. MR. DONAHUE: 13 I'd like to make a 14 motion to take from the table Resolution No. 134 of 2021. 15 16 MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 17 MR. GAUGHAN: There's a motion on 18 the floor and a second to take from the table 19 Resolution No. 134, 2021 and place it in 20 Seventh Order for a final vote. 21 This resolution pertains to the 22 appointment of police superintendent. On the 23 question? All those in favor signify by saying 24 aye.

MR. SCHUSTER:

Aye.

25

The

And

3-A.

1 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. MR. DONAHUE: 2 Aye. 3 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 4 Opposed? 5 ayes have it and so moved. Please dispense with the reading of the minutes. 6 7 MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM KREDER, BROOKS, 8 9 HAILSTONE, LLP DATED MARCH 25, 2021 REGARDING 10 GEISINGER COMMUNITY MEDICAL CENTER. 11 MR. GAUGHAN: Are there any comments 12 on the Third Order item? 13 MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, I'd like to 14 make one comment on it. Taking a look back to 15 2014, I'm not sure -- I see one of the quotes 16 there is that GCMC must have room to grow. 17 I know there's a lot of property there that 18 have been purchased by the hospital. 19 Are these properties taxable once 20 they take them? I know that hospitals pay 21 taxes in some ways but certain types of 22 buildings fall under different categories. 23 I feel like back in 2014 when they first 24 acquired the Audubon School, this wasn't the 25 same thing that they were saying at that point

in time. So I feel possibly their position has changed unless my memory isn't correct.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else?

DR. ROTHCHILD: I'm sorry, I just want to make a comment as well. I believe Councilman Schuster is correct because that's the way that I remember things too that, you know, this wasn't their plan initially. I mean, I'm glad to have this update on, you know, what they're looking to do with the properties.

But I'll definitely be looking for more information on this and what their plans are as it can affect the neighborhood, the Hill Section. That seems like a large space to me. And I want to make sure that the neighbors aren't negatively impacted or affected.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else? If not, received and filed. Any Council members have any announcements at this time?

MR. MCANDREW: I have a quick one.

So now that the Scranton School District,
their instructional delivery model is switching
to hybrid, okay? The food distribution that's
normally taking place is going to change now.

1 So for the Scranton School District. the food distribution will be on Wednesdays at 2 3 10:00 and 1:00 at West Scranton High School and at the elementary schools at the same time. 4 5 Thank you. MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone 6 7 else? I have one, City Hall is going to be 8 closed this Friday, April 2nd in observance of 9 Good Friday. Mrs. Reed? 10 MS. REED: Thank you. FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS PARTICIPATION. 11 12 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time would 13 someone please make a motion to accept public 14 comment from the following individuals: 15 Dobrzyn and Marie Schumacher. 16 MR. DONAHUE: I make a motion to 17 accept public comment. 18 MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 19 MR. GAUGHAN: There's been a motion 20 and a second to accept public comment. 21 Reed, would you please read the comments into the record? 22 23 MS. REED: Thank you. The first 24 submission is from Mr. Dave Dobrzyn as follows: 25 THIS AFTERNOON I PAID MY PROPERTY

TAXES AT THE SINGLE TAX OFFICE AND STOPPED TO
PAY TO PARKING. THE KIOSK WAS OBSCURED BY THE
SUN AND ONE NUMBER WAS INCORRECT. WHEN I
RETURNED I FOUND A TICKET FOR THIRTY FIVE
DOLLARS ON MY CAR, I IMMEDIATELY CALLED FROM MY
CELL AND WAS NOT ANSWERED BUSY OF COURSE.

I WENT OVER TO THE AUTHORITY AND WAS
TURNED AWAY TOLD TO REPLY ONLINE AGAIN NO
ANSWER ON THE PHONE. THIS IS NO MORE THAN AN
EXTORTION RACKET SET UP BY SHYSTERS AND VOTED
IN BY INCOMPETENT COUNCIL MEMBERS WITH THEIR
ILL ADVISED AGENDA. THE AUTHORITY COULD HAVE
CORRECTED IT THERE BUT BY THEIR RULES EVASIVE
AT BEST I MUST TOLERATE MORE OF THEIR
OBFUSCATIONS AND COULD INCURR FURTHES EXPENSE
THIS MAKES ME VERY ANGRY I HATE BEING HAD.

FURTHERMORE WITH THESE DOWNTOWN
BUILDINGS BEING CONVERTED TO RESIDENTIAL THE
TOWN IS ALL PARKED UP AFTER 5 PM. MAKING
PICKING UP ORDERED FOOD A CONUNDRUM I THINK
ITS HIGH TIME THAT IF THIS IS TO CONTINUE IT
WILL PROBABLY AFFECT THEIR ACCESS TO BUISINESS
AND DEVELOPERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO ADD
PARKING GARAGE FEES AND TENANTS REQUIRED TO

PARK THERE.BUONA PIZZA HAS BEEN TREATED CRUELLY IN THE PAST DESPITE A 50 TH ANIVERSARY SIGN IN THEIR DISPLAY DURING THE 500 BLOCK RENOVATION. I WILL ALSO NOTE THAT MOST ARE STILL EMPTY.EMINENTT DOMAIN ABUSE IS MY OPINION AND THEY PROBABLY PAY THEIR TAXES NOT LIKE MOST SO CALLED DEVELOPERS. TAX FREE COUNT THEM IN.

IN MY LAST COMMUNICATION I ASKED FOR AN E-Mail ON TRASH FEES ORDINANCE I AM NOT CONCERNED WITH TIMELY PAYMENT I WAS MORE INTERESTED IN NOT HAVING THE FEE ATTATCHED TO LTS WITH NO DWELLING BEING ATTATCHED ADDING A \$300 FEE ATATCHED TO MY UNOCUPIED PROPERTY. THE MORTAGE HOLDER REFUSED TO OFFER CONSOLIDATION AND I WOULD BE STUCK WITH ADDITIONAL TAX ON A NON DEVELOPABLE PROPERTY TRASH FEE.

18

MS. REED: The second submission by Marie Schumacher as follows:

I again request the same monthly report of how many LERTAs have been requested and approved

24

The 5B Emergeny Certificate states

Parents

the necessity is required to ensure compliance with the Grant deadline of March 30. My question to you is when was this Grant awarded as it seems an certificate should not have been necessary.

As to 6B I believe this is

Governmnt over reached and should not even be

on the Agenda, let alone an Ordinance.

have rights you know,

The photo of the Municipal Building entrance stained glass windows removal brings back the question, long overdue I may add, of when will it be decided what will be done with this Building. When will this decision be forthcoming.

(Concludes public comment letters as submitted to Council.)

MS. REED: And that is all. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Mrs. Reed.
On the question? On the question, I want to

thank Mr. Dobrzyn and Miss Schumacher for their comments and questions. Miss Schumacher posed a few questions regarding the monthly report of how many LERTAs have been requested and approved which we will ask for. But I know as of February of this year, it's been a total of six that have been requested and approved.

As for the emergency certificate agenda Item 5-B, the multimodal -- or GCMC project, I asked why that had come down with an emergency certificate. As everyone knows it's -- I don't like emergency certificates unless it's truly an emergency because, you know, I know that we all like to take our time and review things.

The solicitor -- one of the solicitors for the City, Jessica Eskra replied that they received the proposed plans from GCMC late last month. After that time, the City Planner, the City Engineer and DPW all had to review and sign off on the plans before proceeding.

So she requested that legislation be expedited. But they were up against the March 30th deadline. The grant that GCMC received

was in the amount of \$300,000. We did not get an answer yet as to when exactly that grant was rewarded.

As for City Hall and what's going to be done with the building when will that decision be forthcoming, I don't have the answer to that question. There's a lot of variables that go into that.

One of the issues that we talked about Miss Schumacher months and months ago well into last year was the fact that it was going to be hard for the City to come with up additional funding for all of the items that were identified in the report, you know, detailing the issues with City Hall because it is a very old building and needs some upgrades.

That conversation now obviously has changed with the funding that we are going to receive from the federal government, the American Rescue Plan. So we have to see if we could use some of -- potentially use some of that funding for infrastructure and, you know, I'm going to go out on a limb and assume that we may want to invest some of those dollars as a match to a grant in some other ways to

A11

The

1 improve the building so that it lasts another 2 150 years. 3 Anyone else on the question? 4 those in favor signify by saying aye. 5 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. MR. MCANDREW: 6 Aye. 7 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 8 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? 10 ayes have it and so moved. Okay. We have --11 MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 12 MOTIONS -- oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. Pardon 13 me, Councilman. 14 MR. GAUGHAN: That's okay, Lori. 15 We have a few guests tonight. So we do have 16 They were here about a month ago. MKSD. 17 were the firm that was doing the analysis on 18 the Nay Aug Pool. We learned a month ago that 19 obviously there were some issues at Nay Aug Pool. 20 21 So they were looking over the last 22 30 days at different options, which they're 23 going to present tonight on how the City should 24 move forward. So we have representatives from 25 I know we have Director Cipriani from MKSD.

the Office of Economic and Community Development.

We have Tom McLane who is doing our park study for the City. And we also have Bob Gattens who is the Chairman of the Recreation Authority and Paul Kelly who is the Solicitor for the Recreation Authority. So I'll turn it over to all of you.

And if you want to share your screen and we'll go through this presentation. Thank you.

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you,

Councilman. We appreciate having the
opportunity to present the study to you
tonight. In order to be efficient with
everyone's time, we're going to turn it over
directly to George Deines from

Counsilman-Hunsaker.

MR. DEINES: Good evening everyone.

It's a pleasure to be with you tonight as we progress through our study on Nay Aug Park swim pool. As we, you know, mentioned a few weeks back, we did our initial assessment on the existing pool and found that, you know, due to its physical condition we would recommend a

complete replacement.

We did put together a budget, you know, for renovation, you know, just to get you through I know a few seasons to open up safely. But what we're looking and focusing on tonight is, you know, what are some different options for the replacement of the pool. And so, you know, we're right here in the middle of our study.

We pretty much finished the needs assessment. And now we're looking at the facility program and space requirements, you know, what is the right sized pool for this park, what type of amenities and the corresponding costs that come with that.

Since the time that we last met, we have launched a community survey via the City, sent it out through multiple channels. We had, you know, a little over 200 responses to date. And we captured some information just to see who was responding to the survey.

We found about 70 percent lived in one of these two zip codes surrounding Nay Aug Park either the 18510 or 18505. We also found out about 60 percent of the respondents had

children under the age of 18. And so that, you know, tells us that we had a high level of responses from people who actually used the pool.

Summer recreational facilities like this are typically for, you know, families with young children. You know, we had about 60 percent of the responders say that they had visited Nay Aug Park pool within the past couple of summers.

Most of them had done that for recreational purposes. We also found that, you know, people -- the survey respondents as you see here, this top graph wanted, you know, shallow water, deep water, locker rooms, community aquatic programs, changing tables ranked five which is this orange line that most (audio interruption) competitive pools actually ranked fairly low.

You know, Nay Aug Park pool has not been used, you know, for competitions in some time. So that did not necessarily surprise us. And so we also had an open-ended comment box. And I pulled just a snapshot of some of the comments that we received, you know, I live

within walking distance of the park. My kids used to spend all summer there at the pool with their friends. We truly miss it.

It needs to be affordable and accessible for the average middle class family. Keep it simple. Please save our pool. So we did have a lot of strong support for, you know, a facility staying within the park.

And then the other thing that we're doing right now which is looking forward to our next phase which is the operations plan as we move through the study as we're looking at not only the demographics, you know, age distribution, market area income, population within the City.

But then we're also looking at, you know, what other pools does the City of Scranton have but then what other surrounding communities have and how will those affect, you know, the visitation rates for renovated or replaced Nay Aug Park pool.

And so you could see that there is some density of facilities here. But some of these are indoor facilities that don't necessarily compete, you know, with an outdoor

seasonal facility.

And so as we started to look at the options, we had been working with the City's project team and, you know, using the survey results and using our experience and MKSD's experience throughout the State of Pennsylvania to come up with a couple of different options for consideration.

And so the first one I wanted to provide is mainly just a baseline, you know, what if we just replaced the slide pool. You know, we had that number last time about 1.6 million dollars that would be for the renovation of the pool.

What if we actually replaced the pool, demolished it and replaced it, reuse the existing water slide tower, reuse the existing support building, build a new mechanical building. We could see that in the 5.7 million dollar range. So that just gives you a baseline of, you know, to keep the existing size poor.

But again, no real functionality change with that. You know, the City and Rec Authority have long talked about incorporating

a spray pad where the existing deep pool is.

And so we wanted to look at that as an option as well as a standalone option. So this would include not only, you know, a nice sized spray pad like you see here within a renovation of the bath house, you know, addition of shade, a new pool mechanical building. And we see that budget in that 4.9 million dollar range.

If we just wanted to do the spray pad and keep the existing building, you know, we probably want to budget about 2 and a half to 2.8 million dollars for that spray pad. But a lot of the cost with the spray pad, it's not just the size of the pad itself but these vertical elements and this, you know, little multilevel, I don't know, play structure that you see.

And so spray pad cost can vary wildly just based upon, you know, what size footprint you use but then also the different types of vertical elements that you would incorporate. And so then we also looked at what if we replaced it with a more modern family aquatic center.

And so we did a couple different

things here. The first is that we had a roughly 6800 square foot main leisure pool where we could hopefully tie in the existing water slides into a sectioned off catch area.

We have zero depth entry. We have a small current channel slash lazy river. We have a 3,000 square foot spray pad. And then we also have a -- well, deep water was one of the things that ranked highly on the survey. And so this has a small slide. It's got a climbing wall as well as a diving board.

And so when we add this together, this is about the size -- a little bit larger than the existing slide pool. So, you know, it's in that 12,000 square foot range. We're showing -- actually right around 12,000 square feet so just about the same size.

But, you know, we see that there's different zones. So it's a little more multigenerational. It's got easy access with the zero depth entry. It's got the spray element for the younger kids. But then it also has some amenities for, you know, that 10 to 15 age range with the deep water pool.

And then when we cost this out we

look at not only the construction cost for the building for the shade for the deck but then obviously the pool components and all of the amenities. We also add in some development factors for, you know, a year of escalation project fees from design team surveys permitting.

And then we also carry a contingency allowance. And so when we start to add all of those together, that comes out to about 8.8 million dollars for a facility of this size.

MR. GAUGHAN: George, this is Bill Gaughan. Quick question on that, within that -- I might be getting ahead of myself. But within that number does that -- are you also accounting for if the City were to go with like, for example, this option, does that account for ongoing maintenance costs?

Like, how much -- let's say that, you know, this was built; how much would this cost to maintain and run every year?

MR. DEINES: So that is actually the next step in our process is to develop those annual budgets, you know, the personnel for lifeguards, for chemical usage, utility cost

for pumps and motors as well as annual maintenance as well as long-term deferred maintenance as well.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. SCHUSTER: George, when it comes to operations, what is more efficient or cheaper to run, a regular pool or the splash pad area?

MR. DEINES: Typically it's going to be the splash pad area is going to be much more efficient. Number one is that this is a wet deck. And so it doesn't necessarily have to be life guarded if it's just out in a park and it's free and available. We typically see that those are not life guarded.

But if it's contained inside a facility, we usually see that, you know, you would at least have one lifeguard that, you know, is walking around the perimeter of the spray pad just to make sure that the kids don't run or they're there in case something happens.

But, you know, you take this body of water and it could be, you know, 200,000 plus gallons, whereas the spray pad might only be a

1 16 to 30,000 gallons. And so it would be more -- it's more cost effective to run the 2 3 spray pad than the pool. 4 MR. MCANDREW: I have a quick 5 question. I got this presentation late via e-mail so I didn't get a chance to look at it a 6 7 I'm glad you're going through it. lot. 8 when you look at option one, 8.8 million 9 dollars, you said you're going to propose or 10 actually provide an annual budgetary expense be 11 it, you know, be it staffing and everything 12 else. 13 So -- and I know the survey was a 14 great idea. But did anybody survey the parents 15 and say how much are you willing (audio 16 interruption.) 17 MR. GAUGHAN: Oh, I think Mark 18 froze. 19 MR. MCANDREW: -- what the costs 20 are? 21 MR. GAUGHAN: Mark, you froze there 22 for a minute. So we lost you. 23 MR. MCANDREW: All right. I don't 24 know where you lost me. But I just don't 25 understand how this would be affordable to the

average child in the City. This isn't like a water park we're looking for. We're looking for a pool.

I know every year kids can't even afford to come without vouchers that are given out. So how is this sustained financially? That's a concern of mine. And how is it affordable to the average child in the City?

MR. DEINES: And, yeah, so with our next step we'll come up with some proposed rates. What I will say is that we always account for a certain level of free admissions. And that's typically, you know, based on maybe its levels of income or if Parks and Rec or the, you know, the Rec Authority has the ability to do that, then we always recommend having, you know, the reduced admission for those who can't afford or the vouchers.

Like you mentioned, we also have seen partnering with local businesses to do sponsorships for swimming lessons and for, you know, at risk children because we know, you know, according to drowning statistics that, you know, if a family -- I think it's USA swimming, states that 79 percent of the

children that are under -- that live in homes through the age of 18 that the family makes less than the, you know, median household income of 53,000 that they are less likely to ever learn how to swim.

And so we want to be sure that we do make it affordable to those kids. And then also, a lot of it comes down to the philosophical vision of the City about, you know, what is the right subsidy level. And so, you know, in terms of percentage or in terms of annual dollars.

And so we can -- we could look at that and, you know, we can shrink these options down to make them more cost effective long-term. We'll just look at other ways to help, you know, make the facilities sustainable for the city.

MR. GATTENS: If I could just jump in for a second, one of the things the Rec Authority is looking at is somewhat with what the school district with sponsorships for the score board and stuff like that. But we're negotiating with one or two right now to see if they'll sponsor the splash pad to offset the

cost.

And hopefully, you know, with the grace of God we could make it to where it's free at least to City residents. Outside of the City or people come to visit from out of state or anything would probably have to pay a small fee. But it would be no more than the \$5 they're already -- to get into the pool complex.

MR. MCANDREW: That's a good idea, Bob. Thank you.

MR. DEINES: And then some, you know, representative images just to give you an idea of what some of these spaces could look like, you know, we have a zero depth entry and open water area. We have a small current channel like over in Chambersburg.

You know, there's a different -- a couple different types of deep water amenities from the diving boards, the climbing wall and a couple different types of water slides.

And then the spray pad, you know, as you can see has different types of vertical elements and tipping buckets and (inaudible.)

Those are some representative images to, you

know, show you what those spaces look like in other facilities that we've designed.

The second thing that we looked at in terms of, you know, a completely (audio interruption) would be to increase the size of the splash pad and then decrease the size of the pool so making sure that we allow for the reuse of those existing water slides into a catch area and still maintain some, you know, open water area, a zero depth entry.

This is a lilly pad floatable walk.

And then we have that larger -- larger spray pad. And so the tradeoff was a little bit larger spray pad but then less water surface area for the pool. And when we costed this out, it came to about 7.6 million dollars.

And then the third option in talking with the project team over the past couple of weeks was to have that large signature spray pad and, you know, do our best to reuse those existing slides and just provide a catch pool for the existing water slides.

And so this you have, you know, two amenities at the pool you have existing water slides into a catch pool and then you would

have the new spray pad. So this one is obviously the least amount of surface area for water. So it would have the least amount of cost and that came in about 5.5 million dollars.

MR. HEWES: George, if I can interrupt for a second, George? This is Nick from MKSD. Just I also want to point out that all of these budget numbers and images that you are seeing, they also include an enlarged bathhouse, a pump house.

And also, we're showing a pavilion, you know, for some shade possibly so that could be rented out as a -- or potential for income for the facility if that's something that the, you know, City would desire.

But these budget numbers do include those support facilities as well not just the spray pad and the pools.

MR. GAUGHAN: And we're just looking at where the slide is. We're not talking about the other pool that's going to be filled in, correct?

MR. DEINES: That is correct. We've placed all these concepts, you know, obviously

on the existing site, you know, primarily for size and scale. We were using that existing water slide tower. It's really the one thing that had to stay. So we had to design the pools around that.

You know, we could obviously come out this way a little bit more. We could push this way some too. But, yeah, overall it's using about half of the existing insides of the pool complex, you know. By the time you would measure this out it's going to be, you know, about one and a half times the size of the existing slide pool, maybe two times. So to give you a -- you know, a feel for the size and scale of the concepts that we're showing.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay.

MR. SCHUSTER: George, this was a question I asked last week. The more objects, if you will, that are on the splash pad and around the pool, the more maintenance there is there with those items, you know what I mean, the more things there are to break as opposed to just having a pool.

Who would -- who plans on maintaining all of this? Is that going to be

on the City? Is that going to be the Rec

Authority? Are we using certain companies to replace these items when broken?

And then when we're looking at that cost of yearly operations, is there a percentage added in there for, you know, broken pieces and replacement parts?

MR. DEINES: Correct. Yeah, so when we do develop our budgets here over the next, you know, week and a half, we'll have those allocations for the number of -- you know, based on the number of amenities and the size of the overall facility.

And at this point, yeah, I think
I'll defer maybe to Eileen about, you know, if
it's the City or the Rec Authority who would,
you know, be the actual order and maintainer of
the facility.

MR. GAUGHAN: Can I just say one thing real quick? I just know from going to different splash pads and things that they're relatively maintenance free in terms of, you know, you take your kids there and they get wet.

I mean, there's -- I've never seen,

you know, I guess you could damage them if there's things that are sticking up. But relatively speaking they're pretty much maintenance free in terms of, you know, there's just water that comes out of the holes and things like that. So it's not -- am I correct?

MR. DEINES: That is correct, yeah.

There's a lot of maintenance that goes on obviously behind the scenes. But for the most part, you know, those spray pad elements are very durable and have a really good lifespan, you know, because they're built and constructed to face the elements and face the kids, right, that are running and having a good time on the spray pad elements.

MS. CIPRIANI: And, George, just a quick question in regards to chemicals for the spray pad, are there chemicals used to keep the water clean in the spray pad and obviously if there were (audio interruption) less.

MR. DEINES: Right (audio interruption) on spray pads, you could do a passthrough system which is essentially, you know, like a water hose. It goes up and it comes down and it goes away.

But the way that we design them, they're all on their own, you know, recirculation systems with ultraviolet light technology that kills any type of recreational water illnesses.

And so it's essentially a miniature pool. The pool is just underground and then, you know, the feature (inaudible) pool of water from underground and then spray it up and then there's a gutter in the middle and along the edges that would collect water and send it back to be treated and then spray it up.

DR. ROTHCHILD: I have a quick question. I was wondering what age groups usually would utilize a splash pad and in the survey of -- that the residents did, did it ask what age the children of the household were?

MR. DEINES: We did ask that on the survey. Let me get back to the bullet points there. So close to 60 percent of the respondents had children under the age of 18 living in their household. And we typically find that a spray pad will cater anywhere from ages 1 up to, you know, 10, 11 or 12.

And a lot of time if it's a larger

_

spray pad like that, we might even try to zone it so you have more little kid amenities and then some larger kid amenities just to keep them, you know, a little bit separated so the 11 years olds aren't getting too excited around the 3 year olds.

But we would see having that 1 to 10 to 12 year old, you know, that age range of children.

MR. MCLANE: If I could ask a quick question, the above ground amenities, the towers, the palm trees, you know, all of those crazy good looking stuff that you have there, do they get taken out in the winter time or do they get covered? We have some pretty harsh conditions here in some winters.

I'm just wondering, that would be a level of maintenance that the City would have to take if they needed to be taken down and stored inside or something.

MR. DEINES: I think that it varies on region. You know, we have some folks that will take those down just to avoid, you know, the UV rays over the course of that, you know, September 30th to April 1st timeline. And

then, you know, so they're not affected by the weather.

Others leave them in. So it's typically the discretion of the operator whether they do that. I would say with the size of the spray pad, you know, that we're showing that, you know, I think it would be a tall task to remove all of those elements.

So you probably would leave them up and then, you know, just winterize the system, blow all the lines out so you don't have any water freeze and crack the pipes here in the wintertime.

MR. MCLANE: And last question, I think at some point someone is going to ask what the life expectancy of this is of the improvements.

MR. DEINES: Sure. And so we would see the lifespan of the new outdoor aquatic facility, you know, being in that 25 to 30 year range. And so we design our facilities, you know, with that expectation in mind.

MR. SCHUSTER: And thanks, Mr.

McLane, because I was going to ask that next.

With taking these items in and out, does that

increase the lifespan of these objects and these items?

MR. DEINES: You know, that could actually go one way or the other. You know, the more times you pull something out and put it back, you know, we can see that it could, you know, possibly damage the threads or, you know, however they're put back together.

So we probably defer to the manufacturer's recommendations and, you know, look for some other comparable facilities, you know, within the area to see what their best practices are.

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, that's kind of what I was including in that damage of these things, you know, regular average wear and tear and motors on things and then, you know what I mean, possibly taking them in and taking them out. And back to the maintenance question, so you deferred over to Miss Cipriani. So who would be in charge of maintenance of the equipment?

MS. CIPRIANI: Well, I'm assuming typically, Bob, correct me if I'm wrong, that the City has been performing maintenance up at

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nay Aug Park historically.

MR. GATTENS: Yes, for the most part, yeah. In the last couple years before the pool was closed, we worked hand in hand with the costs and stuff. I mean, naturally it was an exorbitant -- I mean, the City did it. But I could see this being more of a partnership this time going through.

And going back -- let's take a back I reached out to the different water pads across the country. In the Northeast and we'll say the upper midwest and everything, a lot of these places have tarps specially made to cover the equipment so it is covered in the winter months.

And it proves effective to stop the fading and everything. So, I mean, it's something we -- if this is the route we're going and everything, I think we should look at It wasn't an exorbitant cost to have these things made, but they felt it did extend the colorization of the items for a longer period.

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, thank you. That would make sense.

MR. GAUGHAN: Is there more to the presentation, George?

MR. DEINES: The only other thing I had here -- let me see at the end -- was a quick, you know, summary chart that showed the range of cost for the various options that we looked at so far, you know, five of the six would include new construction. Two of them would include zero depth inch pool.

Five of the six would have the -either the existing water slide tower or a new
water slide tower. And then I have the
capacity here listed at the bottom. You know,
that's one of the big questions that we get is
how many people could we expect which is our
next step is to project that out.

But then how many people can the facility actually hold, and so, you know, with the existing pool, just that slide pool would have a capacity of, you know, close to 500.

And, you know, option 1 and 2A that have the pool and the spray pad combined would have capacity of a little over 400, while just the spray pad and then the smaller pool would be in that, you know, essentially 250 people so just

to give you an idea of the capacity levels at one time.

You know, and this is based on the water surface area. And it's meant to be a holding capacity, not a sardine capacity, right? We want to make sure that we, you know, it meets all of the codes and regulations. But we typically like to be a little bit more conservative. And we could push -- you know, put in one person for every 15 square feet of water.

But we typically like to plan on one for every 25 square feet of water. That way, you know, it's more of a operational capacity, not a technical capacity.

MR. GAUGHAN: I have just a comment and then a few questions. You know, first of all, thanks for the presentation. I thought it was great. To me this isn't -- this is not just a pool, Nay Aug Pool. This is a landmark in our city.

This is the -- one of the biggest if not the biggest asset that we have in the City of Scranton. As I mentioned to you last month, I'm up here with my children all the time

walking around the park. And it is used. It's got to be one of the most used parks in our city.

And I don't think that we should cut corners here. I think this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to make our mark and make this not just a pool but a destination for the people of our City.

And quite frankly, I think our children deserve it. I used to work at Shooky's that was next to the pool when I was in high school and college. And there was hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of kids up there every day and parents and families.

And, you know, they would eat. They would go on the rides. They would go in the pool. And it was nice to see. And we've seen that since then over the last few years. So Nay Aug Park to me is someplace that you might look at that price and it is a sticker shock 8.8 million. It's a lot of money.

But -- or whatever amount -- option the City ends up going with. But I don't think we should choose an option just because let's put a pool in there and fill it with water. To

me, this is let's look at the big picture because I know that we're trying to attract people to our City.

And any family -- any young family -- I have four little children. If you're looking to go someplace or you're looking to relocate, you're looking at the parks. You're looking at what kind pools do they have, what kind of amenities do they have among other things.

But that's to me is very, very important. So I really don't think we can shortchange ourselves. Again, I know it's a sticker shock with the 8.8 million and it is a lot of money. But this to me needs a complete overhaul. As we mentioned 30 years ago, Mayor Walsh had a vision and, you know, put a lot of work and there was a lot of thought put into it.

And that was the premier destination which it remained for a long period of time. I just think this is an opportunity for the City to make an investment. And I really think we should. And we should think long and hard, you know, at all of these options.

But I would tend to go with, you know, making a splash, no pun intended. So that's my feeling on it. So I just have three questions. And this will probably go for Eileen or anyone else that is here from the administration.

Have you formulated a plan yet on how the City will fund these improvements? We all know that something has to happen up here to make the facility operational. So is there a plan in place yet or a plan being formulated to fund these improvements?

MS. CIPRIANI: Councilman, we are talking about that and working on that. So there's really three parts to this. One would be the demolition cost. And we're waiting to hear back from the prospective bidders. We have a bid out for demolition. So we'll know those numbers shortly.

And George has included design in his costs already. So there is really three components. There's demolition, design and then construction. So now that we have this information, we could sit down -- and especially with your input, the citizens' input

and try and formulate a plan about what we could do.

Looking at this, this does give us a lot of opportunities, right, because, you know, these prices 8.8 million is big. But we could reduce the size of pools, change out amenities however we best see fit. So we want to take this, digest it and go back to the administration and talk about it.

MR. GAUGHAN: Great. And in terms -- I don't know if you will be able to answer this. But in terms of a timeline, do you think that the pool or do you think there's an opportunity that we'll have a pool at Nay Aug Park next year all things considered?

MS. CIPRIANI: Well, that's another part we have to discuss because we also, you know, with the design part, design has to be accomplished before construction. It would be a matter of how we were able to line up our funding to do this going forward.

It would be a tight timeline though.

I do have to say that. I mean, maybe George or

Nick or Todd could weigh in on generally on a

timeline of projects such as this.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah, I will say that having a pool open for summer of '22 looks unlikely or a new pool I'll say. You know, we have design time. Permitting will come into play. There's a significant environmental permit that will probably be required depending on the amount of disturbance of land in the park.

And then, of course, construction, you know, is probably the better part of the year. The fastest you could get it done is probably nine months for just the construction period. So probably more realistically the inaugural season for a new pool at Nay Aug complex would be 2023.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you. My last comment on this as Eileen said, to me this is a huge opportunity. I mean, for -- I think really and I know we'll go for federal funding, for state funding. Everyone in this area knows how important Nay Aug Park is to the City of Scranton.

So if we're going to invest dollars, you know, we should really go hard at federal government and the state government for grant

funding which I know we will. And I personally am more than happy to help in any way and be involved in these conversations because like I said, I don't think we should shortchange ourselves here.

I think that we really should try to make the biggest difference because ultimately our children in the Hill Section, Minooka, South Side, North Scranton, all over the city, they deserve it.

They deserve a premier place to go and enjoy themselves. And I look at this in the context too of the pandemic. You know, our children and our families have gone through the worst year in recent memory. So to me, this would be something really, really nice to do for the people in our City.

And again, it's an investment in the park which I think we have to make. So that's all I have. Anyone else have any questions or comments?

MR. SCHUSTER: I just have one thing after the discussion about the pool when that's over, can Mrs. Cipriani stick around for -- I just had a question on some grants.

MR. GAUGHAN: Sure. Anyone else on the Nay Aug Pool?

DR. ROTHCHILD: Yes, I just had a couple quick comments. I, you know, I have to agree. I mean, this is in my neighborhood.

And I just had a baby. So she's too young I think to take to the pool just yet. You know, I look forward to eventually taking her there.

And I have really fond memories of when I was a child I didn't grow up in Scranton.

But where I did grow up I, you know, we had a great pool. There were several pools. There was a diving pool. There was a pool where you could do laps. There was a, you know, a shallow area for very young children. And, you know, I learned to swim there.

And I would certainly want the same thing for our kids in Scranton. And, you know, I just think if we're going to spend almost 6 million dollars anyway, you know, I think it really should be accessible to a lot more than just children, you know, say younger than 10 to 12 years old because, you know, I think it could be utilized like with the aquatic classes throughout the years, you know, people in their

60s, 70s I'm sure would enjoy using the pool too.

So I really hope that we would make this, you know, as good as we can. But I realize that is a lot of money. So, yeah, I'd agree with Mr. Gaughan's comments on that. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: You know, I want to piggyback on one thing that you said. And I think Bob Gattens will agree with me as the Chairman of the Recreation Authority. The one thing I can't stand -- and I'm sure there will be some people who say, you know, you're going to put these new things up here and someone is going to ruin them or destroy them or whatever.

I hate when people look at it that way. Like, you know, we should be able to have nice things in the City. We have a park across the street from my house that the City invested a ton of money in through CDBG grant funds. I don't see any wear and tear on that park.

There's no -- no one has vandalized it because all the neighbors have bought in over here.

So we are able to have nice things.

And again, that's one thing that you do hear when anybody in the City wants to do something nice for a park. I've seen that over my tenure on Council, why you would do that, someone's going to ruin it. Well, let's -- we're putting the cart before the horse.

And I think that Bob will agree with me that there's been so many great things done up at Nay Aug Park. So let's again, not shortchange ourselves here. Let's go big with this I think.

MR. GATTENS: I wholeheartedly agree because I'll just give you an example of this past year, January 1st to December 31st, we had zero vandalism in Nay Aug Park, no graffiti, no breakage, natural wear and tear but not vandalism. And part of that is because there's 10-fold people using that park now.

Part of it because of the pandemic, but part of it because it's become a little bit of a destination for walkers or joggers because it's clean and it's safe. And that is due largely to the neighbors and the people utilizing the park, not as much as the board or the city workers.

So it goes back to what you say, I think if we put something that's upscale and everything and the people use it will appreciate it, it will be taken care of up there. So I do agree with what you're saying there.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else? Okay.

All right. Thank you very much. We appreciate the presentation. And, Eileen and members of the administration, we look forward to working with you on this and, you know, being really aggressive to get this done and it's an exciting time for the City.

MR. GATTENS: Thank you.

MR. HEWES: Thank you everyone.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. And I know,
Councilman Schuster, you had -- Eileen, do you
mind answering a question about grants?

MS. CIPRIANI: Sure, if I can.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. SCHUSTER: I know we were -- the City was looking to the county. We were applying for a lot of grants and the county was in charge of dispersing that money. But one thing I was trying to find out and I think

because of the timeline involved with it, I felt I needed to hold you up for a minute to talk about it is PEMA funds.

I know that PEMA and FEMA have given the COVID disaster a disaster relief number DR-4506. Have we applied for any of those funds or do we plan on applying for any of those PEMA or FEMA funds?

MS. CIPRIANI: Yes, actually Chief Lucas had been working on that. The problem came in is what PEMA is willing to fund and reimburse for is exact same items that the county was reimbursing for. And obviously we can't take money from two different tracks.

So I could check back with the Chief to see what we did -- were able to get from them. But I don't think we were overly successful just because of those factors.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay. Yeah, I know with the -- I think with the PEMA, the only thing was I think the municipality had to spend more than \$3,300, which I know we've definitely done that. Would it have been --

MS. CIPRIANI: Everyone wanted to fund for PP or protective equipment. So

everyone wanted to reimburse for that. And you could only reimburse from one source.

MR. SCHUSTER: So would that have been something we could have applied to both sources and whoever covered it we could have maybe reallocated some of the monies or --

MS. CIPRIANI: Right, so what we did was, any of the receipts that we did not get covered from the county, I gave those to Chief Lucas and he turned them into PEMA. So I'll check with the Chief to see if there was success. But as I said, the county basically covered many of the items that would have been acceptable under PEMA's funding too.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay. And I know recently we got word that Mr. Lucas would no longer be our -- I don't know what the term is, emergency manager or emergency coordinator. Have we updated as to who that is and is Council -- did Council appoint that position as of yet?

MS. CIPRIANI: I'm not certain of the answer to that question. But I could check with the Mayor.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, that would be --

I know the answer to that. That is John Judge. The emergency management coordinator the way that it was set up was automatically the Fire Chief. Al Lucas just stayed on in that role I think kind of a transition until -- a transitionary period because he had already been doing it for so long. But I know John Judge is now in that role.

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, that's correct.

I didn't know if we had to -- if Council had to make a move on that or if that was something that was --

MR. GAUGHAN: No. No, I don't think we have to do anything there.

MR. SCHUSTER: So, yeah, at this point in time I think the first step is switching over to Mr. Judge on the PEMA portal and see what we could apply for there. I know there's funds there that, you know what I mean, it would be a shame to leave them on the table.

MS. CIPRIANI: Sure. We'll check with the Chief.

MR. SCHUSTER: Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else?

MS. CIPRIANI: Any other questions?

1 MR. SCHUSTER: That was all from me. MS. CIPRIANI: 2 Okay. Thank you. 3 MR. GAUGHAN: Eileen, thank you very 4 As always, we appreciate it. Thank you. much. 5 Bye-bye. Mrs. Reed? MS. REED: Thank you. FIFTH ORDER. 6 5-A. MOTIONS. 7 8 MR. GAUGHAN: Councilman Schuster, 9 any motions or comments? 10 MR. SCHUSTER: I think the only 11 thing I'd like to do is possibly Mr. Deeley 12 spoke about, you know, taking a look at the 13 reopening plan for City Hall. Maybe we could 14 send correspondence over to the Mayor and the 15 administration and see where they are with that 16 just to get a timeline and see what their plans 17 are for the future. 18 MR. GAUGHAN: Well, I think he said 19 that they were going by the state -- whatever 20 the state guidelines were. So, I mean --21 MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, he also said 22 they were -- they were running their own 23 checklist I think to see if they were ready. Ι 24 forget what terminology he used. I felt like 25 they were running through their own process of

reopening as well that would coincide with that.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Anything else?

MR. SCHUSTER: That's all.

MR. GAUGHAN: Councilman McAndrew, any motions or comments?

MR. MCANDREW: I do. So about two weeks ago on top of Rockwell Avenue someone dumped a bunch of mattresses, chairs, garbage. I reached out to the first shift dispatcher and he politely said I will forward this information onto Mr. Jenkins, the head of -- or the supervisor of DPW.

What I would like to do is have,

Mrs. Reed, please if you would do this for me
actually send a letter because I haven't heard

from anybody yet or nothing has been done.

It's at the top of Rockwell Avenue right across

from the entrance to Career Technology Center.

There's a bunch of stuff illegally dumped

there.

So if we could please have them follow up on that and get me some type of answer because initially I wasn't sure who was responsible. I know it's garbage so that's why

I called the dispatcher. He said, no, we take care of that but the supervisor has to either take a look or approve it. I'm just waiting on that. Hopefully he needs a reminder that he didn't get the message. All right, Mrs. Reed? Thank you.

And secondly, so as Chairman of the Committee on Public Safety, I would like to recognize the Scranton Police Department and the Fire Department for their valiant efforts this week. The first one being the police we saw today that the Street Crimes Unit apprehended a person with a gun, took another gun off the street. The serial numbers were filed off so great job by them.

Also, the fire department for rescuing a cat that was in a tree for four days. I don't know about you guys how old you are, but when I was young I remember hearing that the police and the firemen, you know, they rescue cats out of a tree. And I actually got to see it this week, which I thought was pretty cool. So I'd like to commend them on their great work as always. And that is all I have.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Councilman

McAndrew. Dr. Rothchild, any motions or comments?

DR. ROTHCHILD: No, not at this time.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you.

And, Councilman Donahue, any motions or

comments?

MR. DONAHUE: Just one quick comment. Miss Reed, would you be able to send correspondence to the DPW Director and the Police Chief regarding the issue with trucks continuously hitting bridges throughout the City?

I know the one on Main at the bottom of Euclid for the Central Expressway, I think that's been hit like four times in the past week. So we need to figure out something to do to stop that from happening again. I know the one on South Washington Avenue has been hit multiple times too.

So maybe we could set up a meeting to try to see what we could do to, you know, get this to stop happening. And that's all I have under Fifth Order for right now. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Two quick things, just for the residents on Third Avenue I know I mentioned this last week or the week before. There is legislation that's coming to make Third Avenue a one way from Elm Street down to Broadway which should lessen some of the problems there and also no parking on the one side of Third Avenue from Luzerne Street to Broadway so that should also help.

So the -- I've been in touch with the neighbors out there. And I know that should be coming soon. Also, I received a message from a resident with two questions, Mrs. Reed, if you could just find out and get an update on the Street Sign Program in the City.

I know there's been a lot of progress made over the last two years on that. There are still a lot of street signs that are faded and need to be replaced. I do know the City was going for a grant funding to replace all of those signs. And they've been identified through the Street Sign Program that Council had passed a few years ago.

But if you could just get a general

update on that for the resident. And then this resident also wanted to know the list of properties that are going to be demolished so far in 2021 if there was a list already or a strategy by neighborhood. And that's all I have.

MS. REED: Thank you. 5-B. FOR

INTRODUCTION - AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE

MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE

CITY TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT

WITH COMMUNITY MEDICAL CENTER TO UNDERTAKE A

STREET, SIDEWALK AND CURB IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

AND GRANTING A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT.

(EMERGENCY CERTIFICATE ATTACHED.)

MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-B be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. DONAHUE: So moved.

MR. MCANDREW: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? On the question, this is just to approve a temporary construction easement so that the City gives the rights to the hospital up there to do this project.

This is \$300,000 that's going to be

The

1 invested in that area. This actually is going to also I think help Nay Aug Park. It's that 2 3 whole corridor up there. So there's going to 4 be improvements to the sidewalks, some of the 5 street signs. It will improve public safety, the 6 7 crosswalks. So it's a great project. And I'll 8 be in favor of this legislation. Anyone else? 9 All those in favor of introduction signify by 10 saying aye. MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 11 12 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 13 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 14 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 15 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? 16 ayes have it and so moved. 17 MR. DONAHUE: I make a motion to 18 suspend the rules to move 5-B to Sixth and Seventh Orders based on the attached emergency 19 certificate. 20 21 MR. MCANDREW: Second. 22 MR. GAUGHAN: There's a motion on 23 the floor and a second to move Item 5-B to 24 Sixth and Seventh Orders. On the question?

MR. DONAHUE: On the question, I

25

know we brought this up multiple times how we're not, you know, big fans of these emergency declarations of, you know, there's no reason to vote against this because it's money coming into the City. But, I mean, this was brought to us I think it was over two years ago.

I don't know if Councilman Gaughan remembers where they came in and presented this idea to us. So someone dropped the ball here for this, you know, this to be done by emergency certificate. And I just wanted to make that point.

MR. GAUGHAN: Very good. Anyone else? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL
NO. 41, 2020 ENTITLED "AMENDING FILE OF THE

24

25

COUNCIL NO. 11, 1976, ENTITLED 'AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) ENACTING, IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO PERCENT (2%) ON EARNED INCOME AND NET PROFITS ON PERSONS, INDIVIDUALS, ASSOCIATIONS AND BUSINESSES WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, OR NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, FOR WORK DONE, SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON, REQUIRING THE FILING OF RETURNS BY TAXPAYERS SUBJECT TO THE TAX; REQUIRING EMPLOYERS TO COLLECT THE TAX AT SOURCE: PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION, COLLECTION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE SAID TAX; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES FOR THE VIOLATIONS', BY RE-ENACTING THE IMPOSITION OF THE WAGE TAX AT TWO AND FOUR TENTHS (2.4%) PERCENT ON EARNED INCOME FOR RESIDENTS AND ONE (1%) PERCENT ON EARNED INCOME FOR NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, FOR WORK DONE, SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE YEAR 2021 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER" BY EXTENDING THE DATE THAT THE TAXES ARE DUE AND OWING FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES ON EARNED

1	INCOME FROM ITS ORIGINAL DUE DATE OF APRIL 15,
2	2021 TO MAY 17, 2021 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE
3	UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT AND THE
4	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
6	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be introduced
7	into its proper committee.
8	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
9	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?
11	MR. DONAHUE: On the question, I
12	just want to point out that this is just being
13	done to match up the due date with the IRS
14	deadline that was extended until March 17th.
15	We did this last year too when the IRS extended
16	the tax deadline. It just makes sense for them
17	to be at the same time.
18	MR. GAUGHAN: Very good. Thank you.
19	Anyone else? All those in favor of
20	introduction signify by saying aye.
21	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
22	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
23	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
24	DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye.
25	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The

ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION —
AN ORDINANCE — AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL
NO. 31, 2020 (AS AMENDED), AN ORDINANCE
"AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO APPROVE
THE DESIGNATION OF THE 300 BLOCK OF
CENTER STREET AS A ONE-WAY STREET FROM PENN
AVENUE TOWARDS WYOMING AVENUE WITH THE SCRANTON
POLICE DEPARTMENT TO ENFORCE THE DESIGNATIONS
AS REFLECTED IN THE ATTACHED DRAWING, C-4
CENTER STREET PARKING" TO CHANGE THE DIRECTION
OF THE ONE-WAY TRAVEL FROM WYOMING AVENUE TO
PENN AVENUE.

MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-D be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. DONAHUE: So moved.

DR. ROTHCHILD: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?

MR. DONAHUE: On the question,

Kevin, I meant to bring this up with you before but I just remembered. Shouldn't we be repealing the last designation before we -- and then creating a new designation or a new ordinance in terms of when you codify

Ιt

This

1 everything, you know, so it's less confusing? ATTY. HAYES: This would replace it. 2 3 I can understand it being more -- it being 4 cleaner if we repealed it. This was really the 5 suggested -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Lori, but this was the suggestion of our engineer on 6 how to proceed with this, correct, Lori? 7 MS. REED: 8 To repeal, Attorney 9 Hayes, yes. 10 ATTY. HAYES: Right. So --11 MR. DONAHUE: Yeah, I think --12 ATTY. HAYES: I mean, this 13 essentially repeals it. What's your --14 MR. DONAHUE: Yeah. So it does. 15 repeals it and then we're -- no --16 ATTY. HAYES: No, I'm sorry. 17 amends it essentially. 18 MR. DONAHUE: Yeah, then there's 19 another amendment then to a maintenance 20 agreement. The maintenance agreement could be 21 amended. But in terms of codifying it so when 22 you're, you know, in five years when you're 23 going to search for what this, you know, what 24 legislation gives the right for a one way on 25 Center Street, you know, you're not doing

۷-

circles around trying to figure out, you know, exactly what the legislation says.

ATTY. HAYES: Right. Well, this would be the most -- this will be the final amendment, yeah. This would be the final -- you know, you look -- the last amendment, this would be the last amendment to it. Your thought would be to repeal it and do an entire new ordinance?

MR. DONAHUE: I mean, that would make it easier in terms of, you know, when you do the actual code.

ATTY. HAYES: Okay. All right.

Well, let me look into it and see if we could change it that way. We can amend -- we could change the language and allow this to proceed forward and just amended it at the time it's at Seventh Order.

MR. DONAHUE: Okay, just because it has it going both ways. So if you amend it, the original language would be there and then the amendment would be under it, right, basically so --

ATTY. HAYES: Yes.

MR. DONAHUE: It could be confusing

if you look down the road in terms of that being, you know, an ordinance on the books.

ATTY. HAYES: Okay. All right.

I'll look into it. We can talk again and see if that's the best way to go just do a repeal and replace essentially with a new ordinance.

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay.

MR. DONAHUE: And it's a waste of time. We're doing this again. But that's a different point.

ATTY. HAYES: Yeah. Okay. Why don't you, me, and Lori get together and figure out the best plan on that.

MR. SCHUSTER: So with that being said, this corrects all the issues that the county is having with this -- this road?

ATTY. HAYES: Basically, Councilman Schuster, is my understanding is after they asked -- the problem was that there was congestion on Center Street. And it was making -- it was causing difficulties with -- especially deliveries to service the Government Center.

And so they came to us. They asked

for us to make it one way. They proposed a one way of flowing from Penn to Wyoming. Now they are seeing issues in terms of people exiting onto a two-way street and thought it would be more efficient to reverse it and have them exit onto Penn Avenue.

So this is that -- that's their request. This originated all from the county and what they're asking to make deliveries there be -- and the traffic flow better in that area.

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, this should be the final adjustment.

ATTY. HAYES: I would assume, yeah.

There's only two ways to go. They've gone
both.

DR. ROTHCHILD: They're not going to come back and say we got to switch it back?

ATTY. HAYES: I would hope not.

MR. MCANDREW: How many more parking spots do they get out of this with the one way? I have another question. Okay, this is advantageous for their deliveries. But what about the rest of the vendors? I mean, last time we heard from vendors.

Is this going to affect other vendors and their deliveries because -- I don't know. I mean, I know we got to vote on it.

But I'm going to take a drive by.

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah, we probably should reach out to those that reached out to us the last time just to make sure that the changes, you know, the change of direction is okay with --

MR. MCANDREW: I'm sure they don't even know it's coming so maybe we should provide that courtesy.

ATTY. HAYES: Okay. The big issue last time was the loss -- the biggest consideration was loss of parking spaces I think.

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah. So as long as they're still good there.

ATTY. HAYES: To me this flow makes more sense to be honest instead of trying to flow -- exit onto Wyoming Avenue and make a left-hand turn or to block the sidewalks there as opposed to just exiting making a right-hand turn on -- or left-hand turn onto Penn Avenue. This seems like it makes more sense from a

1 traffic flow perspective. MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Anyone else? 2 3 All those in favor of introduction signify by 4 saying aye. 5 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 6 7 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 8 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 10 ayes have it and so moved. 5-E. FOR INTRODUCTION -11 MS. REED: 12 A RESOLUTION - AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 80, 13 2020 (AS AMENDED) ENTITLED "AUTHORIZING THE 14 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A ROAD MAINTENANCE 15 16 AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SCRANTON AND 17 LACKAWANNA COUNTY FOR THE PAVING, REPAIR, 18 SNOWPLOWING, SIGNAGE AND ANY OTHER MAINTENANCE 19 DUTIES, AS NEEDED ONCE THE 300 BLOCK OF CENTER STREET HAS BEEN DESIGNATED ONE-WAY" 20 21 TO REFLECT THE CHANGE IN THE DIRECTION OF THE ONE-WAY TRAVEL FROM WYOMING AVENUE TO PENN 22 23 AVENUE IN THE REVISED MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT. 24 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll 25 entertain a motion that Item 5-E be introduced

1 into its proper committee. MR. DONAHUE: So moved. 2 3 MR. SCHUSTER: Second. MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? A11 4 5 those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye. 6 7 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 8 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 9 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 10 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 11 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 12 ayes have it and so moved. 5-F. FOR INTRODUCTION -13 MS. REED: 14 A RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF 15 SCRANTON TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS TO 16 17 SUBMIT THE CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE 18 EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER) FOR COMMUNITY 19 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER 20 THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) 21 PROGRAM, HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP (HOME) 22 PROGRAM AND EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS (ESG) 23 PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1, 2020 24 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2020. 25 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll

entertain a motion that Item 5-F be introduced 1 2 into its proper committee. 3 MR. DONAHUE: So moved. MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 4 5 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? A11 those in favor of introduction signify by 6 7 saying aye. 8 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 9 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 10 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 11 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 12 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 13 ayes have it and so moved. 14 MS. REED: 5-G. FOR INTRODUCTION -A RESOLUTION - ACCEPTING A DONATION 15 PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE 16 17 DEPARTMENT FROM GREGG L. SUNDAY AND JOAN M. 18 SUNDAY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5000.00 IN MEMORY 19 OF SCRANTON FIREFIGHTER STEPHEN SUNDAY FOR THE 20 PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT. 21 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll 22 entertain a motion that Item 5-F be introduced 23 into its proper committee -- or 5-G, I'm sorry. 24 MR. DONAHUE: So moved. 25 MR. SCHUSTER: Second.

1	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
2	those in favor of 5-G signify by saying aye.
3	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
4	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
5	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
6	DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye.
7	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
8	ayes have it and so moved.
9	MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A.
10	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 60,
11	2021 - AN ORDINANCE - ESTABLISHING A "NO
12	PARKING" ZONE FOR ECMS 102866 SR 3013 SECTION
13	203, CITY OF SCRANTON MAIN AVENUE SIGNAL
14	PROJECT, MAIN AVENUE (SR 3013) AND ORAM
15	STREET - PERMIT #7905.
16	MR. GAUGHAN: You've heard reading
17	by title of Item 6-A. What is your pleasure?
18	MR. DONAHUE: I move that Item 6-A
19	pass reading by title.
20	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?
22	MR. MCANDREW: Yes, on the
23	question
24	MR. DONAHUE: On the question
25	MR. MCANDREW: Oh, sorry.

MR. DONAHUE: Go ahead, Mark.

MR. MCANDREW: All right. So on the question, so I'm still not sold on this because I posed a couple questions. I'm waiting to hear from PennDOT. You know, I drive by this every day this intersection every day. I drive up Oram quite a bit. And I'm still not sold on this. So I'm voting yes tonight to move it forward so in case I have to vote no, it will be there to vote no.

But I want to piggyback on what Councilman Donahue said. So a block -- so there's all of this concern about safety and -- for this intersection and, you know, I don't think buses even go up it anymore. I could be wrong. But I'm hearing they're not.

But all this concern about intersection safety where I see there's no problems. All right? I live here my whole life. I've never seen a problem there. But a block away, guess what's a block away, a bridge where trucks are getting under as like Councilman Donahue brought up.

So why don't we take a look at the bridge more so than the intersection? It's

2021. I use GPS even instead of a map to drive. Maybe somewhere in there it should be, you know, bridges should be, you know, red flagged about the height versus your truck and for your truck driver.

I don't know if there is -- if an app was developed it would make a lot of money. But I just think I should be more focused (audio interruption.)

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thanks, Mark.

Anyone else on the question? Kyle?

MR. DONAHUE: Yeah, so we did set up a call with the representative from PennDOT for Thursday afternoon. So if anyone else has any additional questions just let me know and we'll make sure we get answers to those before final, you know, before we consider final passage next week or, you know, future weeks because I do think there will need to be, you know, from my perspective at least some changes to this because like Mark said, some of them are just a little ridiculous, but, you know --

MR. SCHUSTER: Mr. Donahue, I'll contact you to get on that call. I wouldn't mind being on that call as well. I mean, my

The

1 concern with this is, like I said last week, I was down on one intersection not similar to 2 3 this but on the corner of Putnum and Main in 4 North Scranton. 5 And once some of that parking got It displaces a lot of residents. 6 pushed back. And in this area we're talking about, there are 7 a lot of apartments and mobile homes in there 8 9 that it think is going to displace a lot of 10 those cars further up that block and down onto 11 Hyde Park Avenue. 12 Anyone else on the MR. GAUGHAN: 13 question? All those in favor signify by saying 14 aye. 15 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 16 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 17 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 18 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 19 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? 20 ayes have it and so moved. 21 MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -22 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 61, 2021 - AN ORDINANCE - CREATING CHAPTER 426 OF THE HOME 23 24 RULE CHARTER ENTITLED "SEXUAL ORIENTATION OR 25 GENDER CONVERSION EFFORTS."

1	MR. GAUGHAN: You've heard reading
2	by title of Item 6-B. What is your pleasure?
3	MR. DONAHUE: I move that Item 6-B
4	pass reading by title.
5	DR. ROTHCHILD: Second.
6	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
7	those in favor signify by saying aye.
8	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
9	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
10	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
11	DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye.
12	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
13	ayes have it and so moved.
14	MS. REED: 6-C - FORMALLY 5-B.
15	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 62,
16	2021 - AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND
17	OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY TO
18	EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH
19	COMMUNITY MEDICAL CENTER TO UNDERTAKE A
20	STREET, SIDEWALK AND CURB IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
21	AND GRANTING A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT.
22	(EMERGENCY CERTIFICATE ATTACHED.)
23	MR. GAUGHAN: You've heard reading
24	by title of Item 6-C. What is your pleasure?
25	MR. DONAHUE: I move that Item 6-C

pass reading by title. 1 MR. MCANDREW: Second. 2 3 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? A11 those in favor signify by saying aye. 4 5 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 6 7 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 8 DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 10 ayes have it and so moved. 11 MS. REED: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR 12 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR 13 ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 59, 2021 -14 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO ENTER 15 16 INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH THE WEST SCRANTON 17 LITTLE LEAGUE, INC. AND SCRANTON SCHOOL 18 DISTRICT FOR THE USE OF CITY OWNED PROPERTY AS 19 MORE FULLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEASE AGREEMENT 20 ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "A" FOR A FIVE (5) 21 YEAR PERIOD COMMENCING APRIL 15, 2021 AND 22 ENDING APRIL 14, 2026. 23 MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the 24 Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage 25 of Item 7-A.

1	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
2	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
3	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question. Roll
4	call, please.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.
6	MR SCHUSTER: Yes.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
8	MR. MCANDREW: Yes.
9	MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild.
10	DR. ROTHCHILD: Yes.
11	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
12	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
14	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare
15	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
16	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION
17	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
18	RESOLUTION NO. 147, 2021 - AUTHORIZING THE
19	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE
20	CITY OF SCRANTON TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A
21	COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY
22	OF SCRANTON CLERICAL WORKERS AND LOCAL LODGE
23	NO. 2462 AFFILIATED WITH THE DISTRICT 1 OF THE
24	INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND
25	AEROSPACE WORKERS, AFL-CIO IN ACCORDANCE WITH

THE TERMS AND PROVISIONS OF A MEMORANDUM OF 1 UNDERSTANDING WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JANUARY 2 3 1, 2021 AND RATIFIED BY THE MEMBERSHIP. MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the 4 5 Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage of Item 7-B. 6 Second. 7 MR. DONAHUE: 8 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? 0n 9 the question, I posed questions last week to the administration. Those questions were 10 11 answered. The Business Administrator Carl 12 Deeley provided -- which I provided Council a 13 breakdown of the costs and savings associated 14 with Collective Bargaining Agreement. So I'm 15 comfortable moving forward. Anyone else on the 16 question? Roll call, please. 17 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster. 18 MR SCHUSTER: Yes. MS. CARRERA: 19 Mr. McAndrew. 20 MR. MCANDREW: Yes. 21 MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild. 22 DR. ROTHCHILD: Yeah. 23 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue. 24 MR. DONAHUE: Yes. 25 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.

1 MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted. 2 MS. REED: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION 3 BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY - FOR 4 ADOPTION - RESOLUTION NO. 148, 2021 - ACCEPTING 5 A DONATION PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON 6 HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FROM TYRONE HOLMES, 7 8 24 PEN Y BRYN DRIVE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA 9 TO DEFRAY THE COST OF THE APPLICATION FEE FOR A CANDIDATE OF THE SCRANTON FIRE DEPARTMENT CIVIL 10 SERVICE EXAMINATION. 11 12 MR. GAUGHAN: What is the 13 recommendation of the Chairperson for the 14 Committee on Public Safety? 15 MR. MCANDREW: As Chairperson for 16 the Committee on Public Safety, I recommend 17 final passage of Item 7-C. 18 MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 19 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? 20 MR. MCANDREW: On the question, Mr. Holmes, thank you for this generous 21 22 That's all I have. gesture. Thank you. 23 MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone 24 Roll call, please. else? 25 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.

80
MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
MR. MCANDREW: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild.
DR. ROTHCHILD: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare
Item 7-C legally and lawfully adopted.
MS. REED: 7-D. PREVIOUSLY TABLED.
NO. 134, 2021 - APPOINTMENT OF LEONARD
NAMIOTKA, 1130 PHILO STREET, SCRANTON,
PENNSYLVANIA, 18508, TO THE POSITION OF
SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE FOR THE CITY OF
SCRANTON EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 17, 2021.
MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the
Committee on Rules, I recommend a final vote of
Item 7-D.
MR. MCANDREW: Second.
MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?
MR. MCANDREW: Yes, on the question,
I'm sorry. So on the question, I know we
played a little volleyball with interim and
acting, the terminology, they mean the same to

me. All right, the Administrative Code in my mind was violated.

And I feel bad for Chief Namiotka. I'm voting yes for him. And he deserves that vote because not only did it go past 35 days, it's over 150 now. And he was in some type of limbo waiting for the appointment. But I'm always, you know, a Council person of process and procedure.

And it wasn't followed this time.

I'm sorry, I disagree with the administration.

And, you know, and one of the reasons where it took so long to appoint because of great turmoil in police departments throughout the country.

That doesn't make any sense to me.

There should have been a sense of urgency to appoint. So I'm happy to appoint Chief

Namoitka tonight. I wish him well and best of luck. And that's all I have.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone else on the question? On the question, just a few things. So this has been something that had been as Councilman McAndrew said volleyed back and forth between the Council and the

administration.

It's an issue that had been raised several times with the administration. And we did not receive really any clear answer on it.

So Council and our Solicitor Kevin Hayes has drafted a letter that will be sent to the Mayor tomorrow morning just detailing our position on this.

And I'm not going to read the whole letter into the record. But I'll just touch on some -- what I think are some important points. There is no allowance as we've said now for this third designation of interim under the City's code.

There's either acting or permanent.

And that was the hang up from the very beginning on this whole thing. The -- Council really strives to take a very careful and deliberate approach to fulfilling our legislative and oversight functions.

We want to make sure that the

Administrative Code is being followed when

we're asked to exercise our appointment powers

under the code. So it's for that reason that

Council raised the -- that the issue of acting

and interim. It says clearly that the City's department head serving in an acting capacity in excess of the 35-day period would be a violation of administrative code.

You either have to be appointed permanently or dismissed which didn't happen in this case. We all agree and have agreed from the beginning that Chief Namiotka is qualified for the position. That was never in question.

But we -- and I'm going to vote for this tonight because we don't want to have our police department or the public suffer as a result of what amounted to a procedural error on the part of the administration. So in this instance to ensure the public safety, that outweighs in our minds the procedural missteps relating to the appointment.

And I think it probably could have been cleared up earlier on. But there were several instances where we didn't get any sort of response, you know, so that was an issue. We do make very clear in this letter that moving forward when an appointment comes in front of us across our desks, we are going to hold all acting and interim appointments to

35-days of service which is in the Administrative Code.

Now, the Mayor has made the point that 35 days isn't enough. And we've stated on more than one occasion that Council will be open to considering more than 35 days. But there would have to be legislation to amend the Administrative Code.

So for those reasons, I'm going to vote yes on this. And then we'll send this letter tomorrow to the Mayor again stating our case and our reasons why and we'll put that in Third Order for the public to take a look at next week. Anyone else on the question?

MR. SCHUSTER: So I don't have to say too much. I echo what both Mr. McAndrew and Mr. Gaughan are saying. I agree with the letter wholeheartedly. I just didn't want to duplicate what we're saying too much. But just I'll support this but -- because of the fact that we don't want the public and we don't want the police department to suffer for those procedural missteps.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone else on the question? Roll call, please.

	85
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.
2	MR SCHUSTER: Yes.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
4	MR. MCANDREW: Yes.
5	MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild.
6	DR. ROTHCHILD: Yes.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
8	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare
11	Item 7-D legally and lawfully adopted.
12	MS. REED: 7-E - FORMALLY 6-C. FOR
13	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
14	FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 62,
15	2021 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
16	APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY TO EXECUTE
17	AND ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH COMMUNITY
18	MEDICAL CENTER TO UNDERTAKE A STREET, SIDEWALK
19	AND CURB IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AND GRANTING A
20	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT. (EMERGENCY
21	CERTIFICATE ATTACHED.)
22	MR. GAUGHAN: What is the
23	recommendation of the Chairperson for the
24	Committee on Public Works?
25	MR. DONAHUE: As Chairperson for the

	80
1	Committee on Public Works, I recommend final
2	passage of Item 7-E.
3	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
4	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? Roll
5	call, please.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.
7	MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
9	MR. MCANDREW: Yes.
10	MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild.
11	DR. ROTHCHILD: Yes.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
13	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
15	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare
16	Item 7-E legally and lawfully adopted.
17	MS. REED: EIGHTH ORDER. OLD
18	BUSINESS. Nothing at this time.
19	MR. GAUGHAN: If there is no further
20	business, I'll
21	ATTY. HAYES: Mr. Gaughan, I'm sorry
22	to interrupt you. Did you announce that there
23	was an executive session?
24	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, I believe I did.
25	ATTY. HAYES: Okay. I just want to

1	make sure.
2	MR. GAUGHAN: Lori, did I announce
3	that?
4	MS. REED: Yes, you did, Councilman
5	Gaughan, immediately after the roll call.
6	ATTY. HAYES: Sorry, I just want to
7	make sure.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: No, that's okay.
9	Better safe than sorry. I couldn't even
10	remember if I did. Thank you. If there's
11	any other business? Okay. If there's no
12	further business, I'll entertain a motion to
13	adjourn.
14	MR. DONAHUE: Motion to adjourn.
15	MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you.
16	Have a nice Easter everyone. Thanks.
17	MR. MCANDREW: Happy Easter, guys.
18	ATTY. HAYES: Happy Passover and
19	Easter.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

$\mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{E} \; \mathsf{R} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{F} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{A} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{E}$

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)

Maria McCool, RPR Official Court Reporter